

PLH



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,262	11/22/2000	Takashi Shimada	1405.1027/JDH	1440

21171 7590 03/23/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1924

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/717,262

Applicant(s)

SHIMADA ET AL.

Examiner

Farhood Moslehi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 7, 10 and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 6. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haigh (5,793,861).

5. As per claim 1, Haigh teaches a multi-channel processing control device comprising:

Process request determination means for determining whether process requests from a plurality of channels are real-time process requests needing processing in real-time, or non-real-time process requests not needing processing in real-time (e.g. col. 2, lines 1-10); Real-time processing allocation means for allocating process requests determined

Art Unit: 2154

to be real-time process requests to processing terminals currently open among channels capable of said real-time process (e.g. col. 2, lines 25-27);

Non-real-time processing administrating means for administrating process requests determined to be said non-real-time process requests, as well as priority levels therefor (e.g. col. 2, lines 27-35); And non-real-time processing allocation means for allocating non-real-time processes administrated by said non-real-time processing administrating means to any of the processing terminals, said allocation performed with consideration given to the priority level and to suitability of the terminal for handling the process (e.g. col. 2, lines 34-40 and figure 2).

6. As per claim 2, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
7. As per claim 3, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
8. As per claim 8, Haigh clearly shows a recording medium on which is recorded a program for multi-channel control method (e.g. col. 2, lines 15-24).
9. As per claim 9, Haigh clearly shows a transmission medium transmitting a program for the multi-channel control method (e.g. Figure 7).
10. Claims 4-7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stent et al. (5,586,179).
11. As per claim 4, Stent clearly teaches for processing terminals handled by operators processing incoming tasks and processing terminals handled by operators processing outgoing tasks, at least one of the operators being a dual-duty operator capable of processing either incoming tasks or outgoing tasks, a multi-channel processing control method wherein the processing terminal handled by said dual-duty

Art Unit: 2154

operator is allocated to either incoming tasks or outgoing tasks based on the current status of the processing terminals handled by the operators (e.g. col. 2, lines 1-42).

12. As per claim 5, Stent teaches a multi-channel processing control method wherein among the processing terminals handled by said operators, at least one processing terminal is kept open for real-time incoming tasks (e.g. col. 3, lines 51-56).

13. As per claim 6, Stent clearly teaches a multi-channel processing control method, wherein said incoming tasks and outgoing tasks include process requests arising from channels including, in addition to the processing terminals handled by said operators, web agents handling process requests generated by Internet web servers, e-mail agents handling process requests generated by e-mail servers, and automatic voice response devices automatically processing incoming signals from public lines (e.g. Figure 2).

14. As per claim 7, Stent clearly shows a multi-channel processing control method wherein said outgoing tasks include pre-planned non-real-time process requests not requiring real-time processing (e.g. col. 6, lines 36-44).

15. As per claim 10, Stent clearly shows a recording medium on which is recorded a program for the multi-channel control method (e.g. Figure 4).

16. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

fm